DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 523 PS 011 813

AUTHOR Hoffman, Stevie
TITLE Bridging the "Gap" Between Home and School.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 26p.: Paper presented at the World Assembly of the World Organization for Preschool Education (OMEP), (16th, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada, July 28 - August 2, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement: Parent Attitudes: Parent Influence: *Parent Participation: *Parent Role: *Parent School Relationship: Parent Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Home Environment Review: *Parent Education Follow Through Program

ABSTRACT

This paper considers home variables of parent-child interaction that affect young children's chances for school success. Data from a study of 1088 families who were assessed with the Home Environment Review (HER) are reviewed to emphasize the significance of parents' perceptions of their children and learning opportunities in the home prior to the time their youngsters entered Parent Education Follow Through (PEFT) programs in 10 communities in the United States. The philosophy and goals of the PEFT are also reviewed in order to relate ways in which the model worked to promote increased parent participation in the education of their children. This participation was generally through cooperative home-school efforts, parents and teachers formed partnerships in the best interests of the children involved. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196523

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BRIDGING THE "GAP" BETWEEN HOME AND SCHOOL

presented by

Stevie Hoffman Ph. D.
University of Missouri

ABSTRACT

This paper considers those home variables of parent/child interaction that make a difference in young children's chances for school success. The data presented are studied in light of parents' perceptions of their children and the learning opportunities in the home setting prior to the youngsters entering the Parent Education Follow Through programs in ten communities in the United States.

Secondly, the philosophy and goals of that particular Early Childhood Education Model are reviewed in order to relate ways in which the PEFT Model worked to promote increased parent participation in the education of their children. Through this home-school effort, parents and teachers formed a viable partnership in the best interests of the children involved.

The presentor suggests that educators have various models for parent involvement in the educational processes of their children; therefore, it would seem that continued efforts should be made to enhance such home-school relationships. This is imparative if we wish to increase the potential for young children's school success.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stevie Hoffman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 01313

BRIDGING THE "GAP" BETWEEN HOME AND SCHOOL

Presented by
Stevie Hoffman, Ph. D.
University of Missouri-Columbia

Presentation given at the XVIth World Congress of CMEP, Quebec City, July 30, 1980

I want to talk with you about home variables---those characteristics of parent/child interaction that make a difference in young children's success or non-success in reaching school expectations. I also want to talk about a specific educational model that continues to provide meaningful ways to work with parents, that makes an effective partnership between parents and teachers, and successfully bridges the "gap" between home and school. And lastly, I want to raise an impertient question: Why not now when we know why and how?

More than a decade ago, educational researchers substantiated theses that significantly influenced curriculum decisions in primary education, especially in the United States. Hunt's 1964 position that intelligence was not a fixed entity---that an "IQ" score only reflected that which had been learned and not the hereditary potential for intellectual attainment---and Bloom's belief that the early years were of vital importance in young children's learning both contributed to the change from early education programs emphasizing enhancement of socialization and creative skills to those stressing increased cognitive challange to children. Havighurst wrote of "teachable moments", when the learner is particularly ready for exploring new ideas. And Bruner's initial thesis that there was nothing that could not be taught any child if taught at the child;s level encouraged more academically-oriented early school learning activities. Even Piaget's writings concerning his theory of cognitive stages of development promoted action by many American educators to attempt to rush children through each stage earlier and faster. We became so concerned with what we taught that we forgot the importance of when, why and how young children learn. This was not the fault of the theorists, but the responsibility of the educators.

During that same time period, however, three reviews of educational systems and programs across nations suggested that school might not be the primary contributor to important learning experiences for children. The Coleman Report of 1964 regarding educational inequality in the United States, England's Plowden Report in 1967, and Rupp's 1969 study out of the Netherlands confirmed that social, economic and educational conditions within homes contributed as much if not more to children's chances for school success than did school variables of curriculum design and implementation. For the United States, one of the ensuing results of these research and evaluation efforts was the creation of the most large-scale early intervention program ever undertaken--Head Start--a program designed for children from economically disadvantaged home environments.

. . . It was the sincere hope of many that providing a "headstart" into school would lead to greater academic achievement for disadvantaged children. If children from low-economic homes received proper medical attention, had improved nutritional programs, learned the expectations of the school earlier, and if social service agencies established contact with homes and parents were invited to become a part of the Head Start program in some way, surely, chaildren would be better prepared for school. Some even dared to believe that Head Start might be the panacea for the educational ills of our country.

However, when the Cicerelli report of 1969 was published---a terse evaluation and critique of the initial Head Start program results---support for the program's efforts rested primarily in the reactions of parents of the children: They wanted the program to continue. For educators, the results were disappointing. Classroom curriculum did not in and of itself produce the lasting gains that had been hoped for. Even with the criticisms of the data analyses and the re-evaluation of the evaluation, it was apparent that home still made a greater difference in children's abilities to measure up to school expectations for achievement than did school. One prominent educator (Keene, 1970) raised a most impertinent question: Could it be that Head Start was a success and the school unsuccessful?

Out of the combined evaluations of this early intervention program in the United States came Planned Variation Follow Through, an opportunity for research-based experiments in primary education. It was decided that Project Follow Through would comprise various educational models, self-selected by school districts, supervised by research Model Sponsors, follow children from kindergarten through third grade, and then be evaluated by an external group to determine if at least one better, if not best, model would emerge which could maintain longitudinal achievement gains for children from "high-risk" home environments.

As in Head Start, Follow Through models have gone through rigorous evaluations. Again, data have been analyzed and reanalyzed. Longitudinal gains are measurable and continue to hold for many of the children in all of the various model programs. Academic achievement gains have been accomplished, however, in different ways: in programs with highly-structured curriculum materials, specific and directed teaching strategies, behavior modification techniques, open education learning, cognitively-oriented learning environments, language-emphasis models, and responsive care models. And, not surprisingly for many of us, in a program whose primary emphasis has been on CHANGE IN THE HOME LEARNING ENVIRONMENT RATHER THAN ON CHANGE IN THE CLASSROOM.

The Parent Education Follow Through Model, conceived and designed by the late Ira Gordon, has had since its inception an underlying philosophy that children's chances for school success are rooted in the educational agenda of the home. Gordon

was a staunch supporter of parents as the first and primary teachers of their children, and a believer that all parents---regardless of socio-economic status---can become improved teachers of their children. Those of us who worked with Gordon through the years also became believers that the interaction between learner and teacher (child and parent) is a large part of that hidden agenda in the home.

This interaction grows out of what parents know about how their children learn, how parents view the home as a learning center, what the home's attitude towards school is, and what the parent expects for their child's education. Gordon also believed that poverty in and of itself does not produce low-achieveing children in school settings. The social-economic-educational status of poverty homes does not necessarily preclude many poor families from positive, growth-producing interaction with their children. This was a basic tenant of the Parent Education Follow Through Model.

If this tenant were to have credance, it was necessary to try to determine what home variables seemed to have relationship to school success. Garber, in 1969, designed a modified and shorter version of the Wolf questionaire which he believed could be used to examine the relationships between a measure of intelligence and the home environment. Garber selected for his Home Environment Review (HER) instrument nine factors, each with five rating levels, which could be administered to parents in their homes by trained paraprofessionals for the purpose of assessing a measure of home environment that might indicate or predict children's potential for school achievement. The nine factors on the HER are these:

1. expectations for schooling
2. awareness of children's strengths and weaknesses related to learning
3. reward and punishment system for learning attainment
4. emphasis on language development
5. availability of language materials in the home
6. understanding of learning opportunities outside the home
7. use of the home environment for learning
8. efforts made towards reading opportunities, and
9. trust in schools.

The five rating levels for each of these factors provided an opportunity for the home visitor to determine the extent to which the parent viewed each of these interaction variables as important.

It is relevant for researchers to know that (1) investigations were carried on to see whether or not this instrument could provide indication of the relationship of home variables to school achievement; (2) analyses of data from these investigations did show that the HER detected such relationships; and (3) certain home variables appeared to predict school performance for the child. The cogent finding, however, was

support for the tenant that some home settings of the poor may prepare for later school success more effectively than other home settings. These reports are found in the writings of Garber, Garber and Ware, Hanes and Shea. (See references at end of paper.)

During the past year and to satisfy professional curiosity, I reexamined the data collected on the HER from 1088 families whose children entered the PEFT Model program a decade ago. These families were in large metropolitan cities, small rural communities, from coast to coast and north to south in the United States. They were of Mexican, Indian, Puerto Rican, Black and Caucasian heritage with the majority from either Black or White non-Hispanic American cultures. The children were entering school for the first time, either into kindergarten or into first grade. Although the research evaluations have substantiated longitudinal achievement gains in the participating children, the continuing impact on families of these children has underscored the program's success. The relevance in studying these data rests in what might be learned that could be shared with today's preservice and inservice teachers who may not have considered nor understand the implications of home variables in young children's school learning potential. A summary of the data follows along with personal interpretation and comments regarding implications for educators.

Data: An overwhelming majority of the interviewed parents (95%) had limited or negative expectations for their child's schooling.

Implications: It may well be that these parents had had too many unsuccessful school experiences themselves had, therefore, believed that their children would also be unsuccessful; or, as poverty parents, had a "now-prientation": children are needed to become part of the labor force of the family in order to earn money for the necessities of the family. Now becomes more important than possible future earnings to be gained from school. School must become a meaningful commodity for families; a good place to be and to stay for children.

SCHOOLING EXPECTATIONS

Factor 1	Freq	Cum Freq.	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Finish College	10	10	0.919	0.919
2) Finish HS	6	16	0.551	1.471
3) Finish Elem Sc	31	47	2.849	4.320
4) Attend Elem Sc	579	626	53.217	57.537
5) Neg Expectations	462	1088	42.463	100.000

Data: About 22% of the parents indicated they were unaware that what and how their children learned at home had importance to school learning; only 20% of the parents viewed their children's learning strengths and/or weaknesses as related to school behavior. Implications: Schools must find ways to help parents believe that what the child learns at home has value at school. And parents must believe that what their children know is appreciated by teachers, valued by the school and used to further increased learning for the child.

Data: About 36% of these parents seldom rewarded in any way their children's learning; 48% of the parents were inconsistent in their reward/punishment patterns related to children's learning. Implications: Parents' attitudes towards the worth of learning is passed on to children. If children believe that learning something is not very important or that no matter how hard they try, no one cares, then teachers may be seen as other disinterested adults with school a place for potential failure.

Data: Over half of these parents felt that it was important that their children speak well and made attempts to correct the youngsters' language. However, over 40% did little or paid no attention to language use.

Implications: It is with and through language that children learn about their world. It is with and through language that parents transmit the culture of the home to children. Children come to school with the language and the meaning of their culture. When the parent/child language interaction is limited and/or culturally different, the child and school usually fail to understand one another.

AWARENESS OF DEVELOPMENT

Factor 2	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) S Rel To S/H	75	75	6.893	6.893
2) B Rel S/Not W	154	229	14.154	21.048
3) Parent See S/H	478	707	43.934	64.982
4) One or Other	144	851	13.235	78.217
5) Unware of S/H	237	1088	21.783	100.000

INTELLECTUAL ATTAINMENT AWARDS

Factor 3	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Clear R/P Sys	54	54	4.963	4.963
2) Aware Rewrd Im	37	91	3.401	8.364
3) Punish No Rwrd	75	166	6.893	15.257
4) Inconsistent	527	693	48.438	63.695
5) Sldm Lrng Rwrd	395	1088	36.305	100.000

PRESS FOR LANGUAGE

Factor 4	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Emphas To Corr	62	62	5.699	5.699
2) Eff to Improv	121	183	11.121	16.820
3) Smtimes Correct	421	604	38.695	55.515
4) Aware/Do Litle	329	933	30.239	85.754
5) No Attention	155	1088	14.246	100.000

Data: Although many of the parents recognized the importance of language, there were no language learning materials available in almost 40% of the homes. Implications: If the opportunities for expansion of language are limited within the home, then teachers must provide increased language experiences in school...language learning that makes sense and meaning for the child.

Data: In your homes and in my homes, children undoubtedly were taught by us as parents every day--when grocery shopping, putting away the groceries, going on vacations, visiting the library, the zoo, driging on a trip. These data indicate that 42% of these parents did little in the way of teaching their children outside of the home environment; and that an almost equal percentage failed to see the learning/teaching opportunities within the home setting. In other words, parents did not view themselves as teachers of their children. Implications: If parents have impact on children's learning, as we know they do, then schools must let parents know in positive and believeable ways that they are teachers of their children, they can be even better teachers, and help them learn how.

Data: Notice how most of the homes had reading materials for their children; only 10% of the homes were found to have no books, magazines, or newspapers. However, only 20% of the parents made any systematic effort to read to or with with their children. Implications: Even though most of the homes considered books important--families did have reading materials in the home--parents did not stress the importance of reading to their children nor serve as reading models themselves. Children

LANGUAGE MATERIALS AVAILABLE

Factor 5	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Ideal Material	123	123	11.305	11.305
2) No Resource Bk	170	293	15,625	26,930
3) No Adult Books	204	497	18,750	45,680
4) Nwspaper/Magaz	166	663	15,257	60,937
5) None	425	1088	39,063	100,000

LEARNING OUTSIDE HOME

Factor 6	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Deliberate Effort	43	43	3,952	3,952
2) Much Effort	148	191	13,603	17,555
3) Some Effort	433	624	39,798	57,353
4) Little Effort	290	914	26,654	84,007
5) No Attention	174	1088	15,993	100,000

LEARNING MATERIALS IN HOME

Factor 7	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Sys Attempts	34	34	3.125	3.125
2) Many Attempts	191	225	17.555	20.680
3) Some Attempts	380	605	34.926	55.607
4) Few Attempts	347	952	31.893	87.500
5) None	136	1088	12.500	100.000

PRESS FOR READING

Factor 8	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Sys Effort	227	227	20,864	20,864
2) Avail W/O Pres	307	534	28,217	49,081
3) Lib Book Use	120	654	11,029	60,110
4) Book Not Lib	330	984	30,331	90,441
5) Not Much	104	1038	9,559	100,000

learn from modeling behaviors; they will consider reading more important when their parents read to them or when parents read for their own pleasure.

Data: The statistics that may have great impact on children's school success are those that indicate that nearly 70% of all of these 1088 parents viewed the school with little or no trust! Implications: If the home seemed lacking in the kinds of parent-child interaction opportunities that might enhance learning potential for the child, parents still did not believe that school would make much difference. Can it be that mistrust on the part of schools breeds mis-trust on the part of homes? Teachers must become more aware of how much parents can share with them about their children and more accepting of home differences.

TRUST IN SCHOOLS

Factor 9	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Great Trust	9	9	0.827	0.827
2) More Trust	44	53	4.044	4.871
3) Some Trust	285	338	26.195	31.066
4) Little Trust	286	624	26.287	57.353
5) No Trust	464	1088	42.647	100.000

How, then, do we build home-school relations so that trust is established between the two institutions most concerned with the education of children? How are the interactions between parents and children changed so that parents grow in their competence as teachers of their children? How do parents experience success in this teaching role so that children emmulate their parents' feelings of self-worth and value? How are the interactions between parents and teachers fostered in more positive ways? And, if all of this happens, does it really make a difference in children's school successes?

The Gordon Parent Education Follow Through Model build upon what schools have done traditionally in providing parents with information and involving them in school activities. To this, however, were added new dimensions to parent education and parent involvement in the educational processes of their children. This is best exemplified by the Parent Involvement Wheel (Gordon, 1976).

Parents have always been audience to the school. Parents are sent report cards telling what their children are or are not doing in school as measured by performance and compared to other children. Parents are told by teachers in conferences when children are having behavior difficulties in the classroom. They are told through letters or at meetings what is needed by the school. They attend concerts, plays and sports events (if their children are participants). Those parents who can read and understand school messages, who can arrange time during the school day to confer with teachers, who come to school events are the ones who benefit from this role. However, those parents who cannot read, who do not understand the school language, who do not have time to leave their own jobs, whose children are not in school events can not even play the audience role.

Some schools have encouraged parents as volunteers---especially, if parents have artifacts from trips to share with a class, if parents have special talents or skills to demonstrate to the children, if parents have a car and time to transport children on a field trip, or if they have time and money to assist in program preparations or parties in the classrooms. However, volunteering is expensive in time, energy and money. If these three factors are limited in a family, volunteering is not possible. Or if a parent believes he or she has nothing of importance to contribute, volunteering is not even considered.

The third spoke of the wheel becomes the heart of the Gordon Model--parent as paid paraprofessional. This model mandates that there be two paid paraprofessionals in each classroom, that they come from the homes of the families whose children are in the Follow Through population, and that they serve as assisting teachers half of the day and home visitors in the homes of the children with whom they work the other half of their time. Because the paraprofessionals are selected on the basis of their target population membership, their own understanding of the cultures of the families in the program, their abilities to interact positively with the parents, there is little necessity to validate themselves to the parents of the children. They are accepted members of the very community in which they will be working.

Parents also know that the home visitors actually know their children in school, see their children in learning experiences, and, therefore, accept the home visitor's interpretation of the school's expectations, and the translation of these expectations into home understanding. Parents trust this liason between home and school. The home visitor also translates the home to the school: brings the home's expectations with clearer understanding to the teacher and helps the teacher to appreciate the culture of the varying homes and the learnings that children bring with them into the classroom.

Most importantly, the home visitor encourages parents to become better teachers of their children. Not with school work brought home for remediation purposes, but with and through activities that are part of the everyday learning opportunities in the home. In this way, the parent becomes an improved teacher of his/her own child in the home--the fourth spoke of the Parent Wheel.

Let me digress from the Parent Involvement Wheel to share with you more about the home learning activities--the vehicle for the home visitor to use in promoting the parent as teacher. The purpose of each home learning task is to increase the positive interaction between parent and child that is so important to effective teaching and learning. The building of a home learning task, then, becomes equally important; especially, when we want the activity to be one which is an ordinary happening in the home and one that both parent and child will find meaningful. (Task format from PEFT printed materials.)

BUILDING A HOME LEARNING ACTIVITY

WHAT IS THE IDEA?

THE IDEA COMES FROM THE NATURAL INTERESTS AND EVERYDAY EXPERIENCES OF THE CHILD IN HIS/HER HOME WORLD.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

THE ACTIVITY CAN BE READING A STORY, LOOKING AT INTERESTING THINGS, TALKING ABOUT FEELINGS AND IDEAS, REMEMBERING SOMETHING THAT HAS ALREADY HAPPENED, MAKING SOMETHING NEW, BUT A SPECIAL TIME FOR PARENT AND CHILD TO THINK AND TALK TOGETHER.

WHY IS TO BE DONE?

THE ACTIVITY WILL ENCOURAGE NOT ONLY TALKING AND LISTENING, INTERACTION BETWEEN PARENT AND CHILD, BUT CAN PROMOTE COMPARING, CONTRASTING, ESTIMATING, PREDICTING, COMPREHENDING, CREATING, AND ESPECIALLY PARTICIPATING.

HOW IS IT TO BE DONE?

THE HOW BECOMES A SUGGESTED STEP BY STEP PLAN OF ACTION FOR BOTH PARENT AND CHILD: WHAT, HOW, WHEN, WHY, WHAT ELSE, SHOW ME, AND TELL ME, ARE CLUE WORDS TO HOW THE ACTIVITY WILL BE CARRIED OUT.

WHAT ELSE CAN BE DONE?

MORE SUGGESTIONS FOR DOING THE SAME KINDS OF THINGS IN MANY DIFFERENT WAYS SO THAT LEARNING AND TEACHING CARRIES OVER INTO RELATED AREAS OF INTERES. AND NEEDS.

We can begin to determine whether or not the task idea is a "good" one by checking it with eight criteria for a good home learning activity. (Taken from PEFT printed materials.)

However, the teaching-learning situation is greatly enhanced when the teaching behaviors of the parent are such that the knows and enjoys the learning situation. These teaching behaviors have come to be known as the Desirable Teaching Behaviors: behaviors resulting in the positive interaction between teacher and learner (parent and child) that changes those home variables that can make the difference between effective and noneffective learning. In the interaction process, parent and child join in what Gordon referred to as the "ping' pong" pattern--teacher and learner respond to one another in an action-reaction relationship.

EIGHT CRITERIA

HOW DO YOU KNOW YOU HAVE A GOOD TASK?

WHEN:

1. THE LEARNER DOES A LOT OF TALKING LIKE: HE TELLS ABOUT THINGS, GIVES REASONS, ASKS QUESTIONS, TELLS YOU WHY, WHAT, WHERE, AND HOW.
2. THE LEARNER HAS FUN DOING IT. THERE'S A LOT OF INTEREST AND ACTION.
3. THE DIRECTIONS ARE CLEAR ENOUGH THAT IT CAN BE TAUGHT.
4. YOU AND THE LEARNER UNDERSTAND WHY YOU ARE DOING IT; WHAT IT'S FOR.
5. IT ENCOURAGES THE TEACHER-PARENT TO USE A LOT OF WAYS TO TEACH, AND THE LEARNER TO TRY DIFFERENT WAYS TO DO IT. THAT IS, IT'S NOT CUT AND DRIED, BUT TAKES THINKING AND SWINGING WITH WHAT HAPPENS.
6. IF POSSIBLE, HOME MATERIALS ARE USED.
7. THE LEARNER KNOWS HE HAS LEARNED SOMETHING; HE CAN SEE IT RIGHT AWAY AND FEELS GOOD ABOUT IT.
8. THE LEARNER IS ENCOURAGED TO THINK OF NEW ACTIVITIES OR THINGS TO DO WHICH GROW OUT OF THE TASK.

DESIRABLE TEACHING BEHAVIORS

1. GET THE LEARNER TO ASK QUESTIONS.
2. ASK QUESTIONS THAT HAVE MORE THAN ONE CORRECT ANSWER.
3. ASK QUESTIONS THAT REQUIRE MORE THAN ONE WORD AS AN ANSWER.
4. ECOURAGE THE LEARNER TO ENLARGE UPON HIS ANSWER.
5. PRAISE THE LEARNER WHEN HE DOES WELL OR TAKES SMALL STEPS IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION.
6. LET THE LEARNER KNOW WHEN HIS ANSWER OR WORK IS WRONG, BUT DO SO IN A POSITIVE OR NEUTRAL WAY.
7. GET THE LEARNER TO MAKE JUDGMENTS ON THE BASIS OF EVIDENCE RATHER THAN BY GUESSING.
8. DURING THE ACTIVITY, GIVE THE LEARNER TIME TO THINK ABOUT THE PROBLEM; DON'T BE TOO QUICK TO HELP.
9. BEFORE STARTING THE ACTIVITY, GIVE THE LEARNER TIME TO FAMILIARIZE HIMSELF WITH THE TASK MATERIALS.
10. BEFORE STARTING THE ACTIVITY, EXPLAIN WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO DO.

When parents view themselves as teachers of their children, when they begin to see that how they view learning is important for their children, they, too, become learners. And as they become successful, they become better decision makers regarding their children's education. The Parent Wheel becomes complete. There is established a partnership with teachers and schools, parents and home. In the PEFT Model, parents have built trust in schools as schools have also built trust in parents. Homes have changed; schools have changed; and the impact on the communities in which home-school partnerships have become actualized has been nothing but positive.

Let me conclude my presentation with some personal and professional beliefs.

1. We have evidence from many sources that the home does indeed make a difference in children's learning--not just because it is an advantaged or disadvantaged home, economically-speaking, but because of other variables that can be changed.

2. We have evidence that parents can become better teachers of their children--all parents, regardless of socio-economic status.

3. We know that change takes time; but we have a model to show us how effective change can occur.

4. We cannot afford to ignore all of the evidence we have that has been learned from parents, teachers, children, and researchers. Nor can we say, "Things are different now, in 1980. Schools have changed." I would like to suggest that if 1088 poverty families from similar communities and racial/ethnic backgrounds were interviewed in similar ways with this same instrument, that we would find data just like that which I have shared with you today.

5. And, furthermore, I would like to suggest that these statistics might well be found in interviewing many middle-class families in the United States.

The most important point that I want to leave with each of you is that in no way am I suggesting that schools place a "guilt trip" on homes. Quite the contrary: I emphatically suggest that homes can be richer learning environments when schools build upon the strengths of families and their cultures; that parents care about their children and their education; that they want to be teachers of their children when that teaching is shown to have relevance to school learning; and that untill we as educators value parents as partners in children's education, we will not see an appreciable difference in children's lasting school success.

When we know why and how, why are we not now bridging the "gap" between home and school in meaningful and effective home-school partnerships? When parent education becomes fact, then parental involvement becomes actual, active and viable. "Programs that produce more than temporary desirable effects on children are most likely to have made provisions for parent involvement in the educational processes of their children. In other words, parental involvement is one factor that early distinguishes more from less potent educational programs" (Evans, 1975).

References

Bloom, B. S. Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Bruner, J. The process of education. Cmbridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960,

Garber, M. The home environment review. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute for Development of Human Resources, University of Florida, 1970.

Garber, M. & Ware, W. The Home Environment as a Predictor of School Achievement, Theory into Practice., Vol. XII, No. 3, June, 1972.

Gordon, I. J., & Breivogel, W. F. (Eds.) Building effictive home-school relationships. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Evans, E. D. Contemporary influences in early childhood education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1975.

Hanes, M., & Shea, J. The relationship between measures of home environment and school achievement of Follow Through children. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977.

Havighurst, R. Developmental tasks and education. New York: Longmans, Green, 1952.

Hunt, J. M. Intelligence and experience. New York: The Ronald Press, Co., 1961.

Kean, J. M. Review of the impact of Head Start: An evaluation of the effects of Head Start on children's cognitive and affective development. (A review of the Cicirelli report.) Childhood Education, 1970, 46, 449-451.

Maccoby, E., & Zellner, M. Experiments in primary education: Aspects of project Follow Through. New York: Harcourt, 1970.

* Building a Home Learning Activity, The Eight Criteria for a Good Task, and The Desirable Teaching Behaviors came from mimeographed material used in PEFT Program. Elaboration of these can be found in Gordon & Breivogel, listed above.

This paper was a result of a study sponsored by the University Research Council, University of Missouri-Columbia.

SCHOOLING EXPECTATIONS

Factor 1	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Finish College	10	10	0.919	0.919
2) Finish HS	6	16	0.551	1.471
3) Finish Elem Sc	31	47	2.849	4.320
4) Attend Elem Sc	579	626	53.217	57.537
5) Neg Expections	462	1088	42.463	100.000

AWARENESS OF DEVELOPMENT

Factor 2	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) S Rel To S/W	75	75	6.893	6.893
2) B Rel S/Not W	154	229	14.154	21.048
3) Parent See S/W	478	707	43.934	64.982
4) One or Other	144	851	13.235	78.217
5) Unware of S/W	237	1088	21.783	100.000

INTELLECTUAL ATTAINMENT AWARDS

Factor 3	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Clear R/P Sys	54	54	4.963	4.963
2) Aware Rewrd Im	37	91	3.401	8.364
3) Punish No Rwrd	75	166	6.893	15.257
4) Inconsistent	527	693	48.438	63.695
5) Sldm Lrng Rwrd	395	1088	36.305	100.000

PRESS FOR LANGUAGE

FACTOR 4	FREQ	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
1) EMPHAS TO CORR	62	62	5.699	5.699
2) EFRT TO IMPROV	121	183	11.121	16.820
3) SMTIMES CORRCT	421	604	38.695	55.515
4) AWARE/DO LITLE	329	933	30.239	85.754
5) NO ATTENTION	155	1088	14.246	100.000

LANGUAGE MATERIALS AVAILABLE

Factor 5	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Ideal Material	123	123	11.305	11.305
2) No Resource Bk	170	293	15,625	26,930
3) No Adult Books	204	497	18,750	45,680
4) Nwspaper/Magaz	166	663	15,257	60,937
5) None	425	1088	39,063	100,000

LEARNING OUTSIDE HOME

Factor 6	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Delibrte Efort	43	43	3,952	3,952
2) Much Effort	148	191	13,603	17,555
3) Some Effort	433	624	39,798	57,353
4) Little Effort	290	914	26,654	84,007
5) No Attention	174	1088	15,993	100,000

LEARNING MATERIALS IN HOME

FACTOR Z	FREQ	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
1) SYS ATTEMPTS	34	34	3.125	3.125
2) MANY ATTEMPTS	191	225	17.555	20.680
3) SOME ATTEMPTS	380	605	34.926	55.607
4) FEW ATTEMPTS	347	952	31.893	87.500
5) NONE	136	1088	12.500	100.000

PRESS FOR READING

Factor 8	Freq	Cum Freq	Percent	Cum Percent
1) Sys Effort	227	227	20,864	20,864
2) Avail W/O Pres	307	534	28,217	49,081
3) Lib Book Use	120	654	11,029	60,110
4) Book Not Lib	330	984	30,331	90,441
5) Not Much	104	1088	9,559	100,000

TRUST IN SCHOOLS

FACTOR 9	FREQ	CUM FREQ	PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
1) GREAT TRUST	9	9	0.827	0.827
2) MORE TRUST	44	53	4.044	4.871
3) SOME TRUST	285	338	26.195	31.066
4) LITTLE TRUST	286	624	26.287	57.353
5) NO TRUST	464	1088	42.647	100.000

BUILDING A HOME LEARNING ACTIVITY

WHAT IS THE IDEA?

THE IDEA COMES FROM THE NATURAL INTERESTS AND EVERYDAY EXPERIENCES OF THE CHILD IN HIS/HER HOME WORLD.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

THE ACTIVITY CAN BE READING A STORY, LOOKING AT INTERESTING THINGS, TALKING ABOUT FEELINGS AND IDEAS, REMEMBERING SOMETHING THAT HAS ALREADY HAPPENED, MAKING SOMETHING NEW, BUT A SPECIAL TIME FOR PARENT AND CHILD TO THINK AND TALK TOGETHER.

WHY IS TO BE DONE?

THE ACTIVITY WILL ENCOURAGE NOT ONLY TALKING AND LISTENING, INTERACTION BETWEEN PARENT AND CHILD, BUT CAN PROMOTE COMPARING, CONTRASTING, ESTIMATING, PREDICTING, COMPREHENDING, CREATING, AND ESPECIALLY PARTICIPATING.

HOW IS IT TO BE DONE?

THE HOW BECOMES A SUGGESTED STEP BY STEP PLAN OF ACTION FOR BOTH PARENT AND CHILD: WHAT, HOW, WHEN, WHY, WHAT ELSE, SHOW ME, AND TELL ME, ARE CLUE WORDS TO HOW THE ACTIVITY WILL BE CARRIED OUT.

WHAT ELSE CAN BE DONE?

MORE SUGGESTIONS FOR DOING THE SAME KINDS OF THINGS IN MANY DIFFERENT WAYS SO THAT LEARNING AND TEACHING CARRIES OVER INTO RELATED AREAS OF INTERESTS AND NEEDS.

EIGHT CRITERIA

HOW DO YOU KNOW YOU HAVE A GOOD TASK?

WHEN:

1. THE LEARNER DOES A LOT OF TALKING LIKE: HE TELLS ABOUT THINGS, GIVES REASONS, ASKS QUESTIONS, TELLS YOU WHY, WHAT, WHERE, AND HOW.

2. THE LEARNER HAS FUN DOING IT. THERE'S A LOT OF INTEREST AND ACTION.

3. THE DIRECTIONS ARE CLEAR ENOUGH THAT IT CAN BE TAUGHT.

4. YOU AND THE LEARNER UNDERSTAND WHY YOU ARE DOING IT; WHAT IT'S FOR.

5. IT ENCOURAGES THE TEACHER-PARENT TO USE A LOT OF WAYS TO TEACH, AND THE LEARNER TO TRY DIFFERENT WAYS TO DO IT. THAT IS, IT'S NOT CUT AND DRIED, BUT TAKES THINKING AND SWINGING WITH WHAT HAPPENS.

6. IF POSSIBLE, HOME MATERIALS ARE USED.

7. THE LEARNER KNOWS HE HAS LEARNED SOMETHING; HE CAN SEE IT RIGHT AWAY AND FEELS GOOD ABOUT IT.

8. THE LEARNER IS ENCOURAGED TO THINK OF NEW ACTIVITIES OR THINGS TO DO WHICH GROW OUT OF THE TASK.

DESIRABLE TEACHING BEHAVIORS

1. GET THE LEARNER TO ASK QUESTIONS.

2. ASK QUESTIONS THAT HAVE MORE THAN ONE CORRECT ANSWER.

3. ASK QUESTIONS THAT REQUIRE MORE THAN ONE WORD AS AN ANSWER.

4. ECOURAGE THE LEARNER TO ENLARGE UPON HIS ANSWER.

5. PRAISE THE LEARNER WHEN HE DOES WELL OR TAKES SMALL STEPS IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION.

6. LET THE LEARNER KNOW WHEN HIS ANSWER OR WORK IS WRONG, BUT DO SO IN A POSITIVE OR NEUTRAL WAY.

7. GET THE LEARNER TO MAKE JUDGEMENTS ON THE BASIS OF EVIDENCE RATHER THAN BY GUESSING.

8. DURING THE ACTIVITY, GIVE THE LEARNER TIME TO THINK ABOUT THE PROBLEM; DON'T BE TOO QUICK TO HELP.

9. BEFORE STARTING THE ACTIVITY, GIVE THE LEARNER TIME TO FAMILIARIZE HIMSELF WITH THE TASK MATERIALS.

10. BEFORE STARTING THE ACTIVITY, EXPLAIN WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO DO.